DRAFT MINUTES
DATA COMMITTEE MEETING
JUNE 28, 2004

Attendees: J. Rubinstein, J. Dunscomb, J. Irving, R. Royall, M. Heller, D. Nelms, T. Wagner, J. Hassell, S. Kudlas Guest: Katrina Blankenship

The meeting began with a review of the draft agenda and introductions of members in attendance.

The meeting moved on to a discussion of some of the recommendations or assumptions of the WP-TAC from last year that resulted in the creation of this committee:

- Assumption: data currently exists that has not been analyzed that would assist in planning.
- Assumption: data "gaps" exist in surface and groundwater data that need to be addressed for meaningful planning.
- Recommendation: a single source for data, preferably web-based, should be set up for localities to use for their planning efforts.

There was also a concern expressed last year about how the state will use the data collected from this planning process.

The meeting continued with a discussion of available data sets maintained or held by committee members:

- The Army Corps of Engineers will report back on what data they have that may be useful, particularly GIS-based data sets.
- The Division of Mineral Resources has 1:500,000 scale geologic mapping for the entire state, a 1:24,000 scale Karst mapping, some detailed local geologic data for a few localities (Fluvanna, Albemarle, and Scott counties), and they are in the process of entering well records from 1950-1970 into a database.
- The U.S. Geologic Service has significant data including historic and real time surface and groundwater monitoring, Virginia water use by county, and other historic data in paper form.

There appeared to be general agreement that existing groundwater data in their current form would be inadequate to conduct meaningful local-scale water resource and water supply planning and to evaluate the sustainability of the plans generated by the proposed planning requirement. In addition, there appeared to be general agreement that it probably was unwise to establish the integrating of existing data into one location as our highest priority for any new resources.

There was further discussion of data management by multiple agencies and well completion reports were used as an example. Well identification can often be difficult with this information because they are often different agency identification numbers. This led to a presentation by Robert Royall on a data base product he has launched that has automated the current Well Completion Report for use by well drillers in the field or office. After hearing the presentation, there was general agreement that this could be a very useful means of acquiring new groundwater related data. One concern was which state agency (VDH or DEQ) should have the lead in supporting management of this data.

After a short break, the meeting moved on to a discussion of what kind of resolution is acceptable for water supply planning.

- Most of the group felt that for surface water, information was pretty much in place until you reached a medium sized watershed.
- For groundwater, there was general agreement that bedrock surface geology at 1:24,000 was needed and ideally local well data.

After some discussion, the following clarifying questions were developed to guide the group:

- How much water is being used?
- How much water do you expect to use during the planning period?
- Can the source sustain that expected amount of use?

A suggestion was made by USGS that a first cut of a water budget could be done for water planning. The general limitations of producing these budgets are:

- The resolution is dependent on where your gages are;
- Enough wells would need to be identified to establish water levels; and
- Staff and financial resources to complete the analyses.

There was additional discussion of useful examples of existing efforts such as ICPRB's groundwater project, the Northern Shenandoah Water Project, and the study that North Carolina has initiated regarding groundwater source sustainability. It was noted that the North Carolina effort took 3 years of preparation and is a 10-year study funded at $500,000 per year.

The Committee moved on to a discussion of the need to provide guidance to localities regarding assessing the needs of instream uses. DEQ provided a report on some preliminary discussions held with DGIF and some of the TAC representing conservation interests. The group identified an effort in Texas that is to be reviewed by the National Science Foundation as a model to look at. DEQ also defined some issues regarding safe yield that will need further discussion and resolution. These issues will be taken up at a later date.

The Committee recommended that prior to the next meeting that DEQ define:

- What the data needs are?
- Where we are in acquiring that data?
- What next steps are suggested to get to where we need to be?

The meeting was then adjourned.